UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/650,880	08/28/2003	Joseph Sheinis	5681-64700	8735

35690 7590 02/26/2007	EXAMINER
MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C.	SEYE, ABDOU K
700 LAVACA, SUITE 800	
AUSTIN, TX 78701	

	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	2194	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/26/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 10/06)

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/650,880	SHEINIS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Abdou Karim Seye	2194

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>03</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 January 2007</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>01/05/2007;08/28/2003</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed on January 05, 2007 has been received and entered. The currently

pending claims considered below are Claims 1-28.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form

the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

b) The invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or
in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for
patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-7, 10-13 and 15-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by **Granade, et al. (US 20020103881).**

Claim 1, Granade, teaches a system, comprising: an application server (fig.1/112)

comprising: an application component whose data is represented in a system default

locale (fig. 2/203; paragraph 75);

localization logic configured to translate input parameters or return values between the

system default locale and another locale (fig. 2/202; paragraph 42, 50 and 62); and

interception logic configured to intercept a plurality of method calls to the application

component (fig. 2/102; back end application); wherein the interception logic is

configured to invoke the localization logic and the application component in response
to one or more of the plurality of method calls (paragraph 50 and 63; invoking the
integration manager application passing resulting information produced to the mobile
device).

Claim 2, <u>Granade</u> teaches,

wherein the localization logic is separate from the application component (fig. 2/203
and 202 are separated).

Claim 3, <u>Granade</u> teaches,

wherein the application component is configured to operate on data stored in a primary
database table in which the data is represented in the system default locale (fig. 2/210
paragraph 37).

Claim 4, <u>Granade</u> teaches,

wherein the application component is configured to invoke one or more Java Data
Base Connectivity methods to maintain the primary database table; the claimed
element "java" in (paragraph 42) of grenade reference meets the claimed limitation of
the claim.

Claim 5, <u>Granade</u> teaches, wherein the localization logic is configured to operate on data stored in one or more localization database tables in which the data is represented in a locale other than the system default locale (fig. 2/102; paragraph 26 and 36).

As per claim 6, it is rejected in the same reasons as claim 4 above.

Claim 7, <u>Granade</u> teaches,

wherein the interception logic includes one or more dynamic proxies that are configured to intercept application component method calls before the execution of the method (paragraph 37).

Claim 10, <u>Granade</u> teaches, a metadata file indicating the system default locale and translatable table information for the application component (paragraph 38).

As per claims 11,12, 13 15,16,17,18 and 19 , they are rejected for the same reasons as the claims above.

As per claims 20, they are rejected for the same reasons as the claims above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 8 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Granade, et al. (US 20020103881) in view of Upton (20030110315).

Claims 8 and 14, <u>Granade</u> teaches a localization unit that includes methods as in claim

1 above, wherein these method could be written in java (paragraph 42), but he does

not explicitly discloses,

wherein the localization logic is configured to make one or more Java reflection calls to

determine whether input parameters to, or return values from the application

component are localizable. However, in the same field of endeavor, <u>Upton</u> discloses a

JSP templates that can leverage the internationalization and localization feature of the

java platform (paragraph 99) and the use of java API reflection to determine methods

to invoke on a request (paragraph 81 and 121).

It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to modify <u>Granade's</u> invention with <u>Upton's</u> invention to include java reflection

API within the localization logic to make java refection calls to determine whether input

parameters to, or return values from the application component are localizable,

because it would greatly simplify the interaction with the back end database resources

for methods call and the return values. One would have been motivated to include

Java reflection API in an integrated system with web access to the back end systems

in order to get and set the value of an object's field such as local data, even if the field

name is unknown to your program until runtime.Therefore to get fast information

retrieval from storage area.

6. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Granade, et**

al. (US 20020103881) in view of Graham et al. (20020046240).

Claim 9, <u>Granade</u> teaches a localization logic as in claim 1 above, but he does not

explicitly discloses,

wherein the localization logic configured to invoke localization functions before and

after the execution of the method. However, in the same field of endeavor, <u>Graham</u>

discloses a "GetLocale ()" method to determine a user's current locale (paragraph 34)

and a logic methods to validate and process the fields before and after invoking the

execution of the method (paragraph 67, 68, 82, 83 and 84). It would be obvious to one

having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify <u>Granade's</u>

invention with <u>Graham's</u> invention to include a localization logic configured to invoke

localization functions before and after the execution of the method, because it would

help reduce user errors when accessing data in a storage area. One would have been

motivated to use a validation method within a localization function in order provide

users of client /server environment a redisplay of localized error message associated

with input fields saved, so the user does not have to re-enter any valid information.

Therefore to improve efficiency of the overall system.

As per claims 21-28, they are rejected for the same reasons as the claims above.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed January 05, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

a. Claim 1 Applicant argues that, " Grenade fails to teach interception logic configured to

intercept a plurality of method calla to the application component, **Wherein the**

interception logic is configured to invoke the localization logic in response to one

or more of the plurality of method calls". Granade teaches in (paragraph 50 and 63)

the step of invoking the integration manager (localization logic) passing resulting

information produced to the mobile device. This middleware sitting between the

interception logic (backend systems) and the front end application is always invoked

during client request and response for access to data based information. Therefore

Granade's reference meets the claimed limitation of the claim.

b. Claim 11, Applicant argues that "Grenade fails to teach a method comprising

creating a dynamic proxy for an application component comprising one or more

localizable parameters or return values". Grenade teaches in paragraph 37 having a

localization proxy server for providing service to a mobile device interface with local

variable in the application. Therefore Granade's reference meets the claimed limitation

of the claim.

c. Claim 12 see rejections of claim 8 above.

d. Claim 9, see rejection of claim 9 above.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the

applicant's disclosure.

Latvakoski et al (20040153548) discloses a configuration method and system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Exr. Abdou Seye whose telephone number is

(571) 270-1062. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday

from 7:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, contact

the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson at (571) 272-3718. The fax phone

number for formal or official faxes to Technology Center 3600 is (571) 273-8300.

Draft or informal faxes, which will not be entered in the application, may be

submitted directly to the examiner at (571) 273-6722.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the Group Receptionist whose telephone

number is (571) 272-3600.

WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

AKS   William Thomson
February, 16 2007   Supervisory Patent Examiner